

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-16 are amended. The claims are amended to recite “a plurality of maps” in the place of “pieces of map data.” Other amendments correct minor informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not present new issues that would require further consideration and search, especially when considering Applicants’ originally filed description and claimed features relating to selecting a map from pieces of map data and the language, “configured to present the individual maps ...,” as recited in claim 1, 8 and 9, for example.

The present amendments are made in view of the Examiner’s comments on page 3, lines 4-8 of the final Office Action. More specifically, in response to the arguments presented starting in the last paragraph of page 7 to 9 of Applicants’ response of April 5, 2006, the Examiner asserts, “The claims do not state that the in-vehicle unit or computer contain *a plurality of maps* but rather that a map is selected from the *pieces of map data*, which is interpreted as selecting a portion of the map to display with a specified range or scale in which information requested is to be displayed on, such as a size of neighborhood (paragraphs [0074-0076]).” While Applicants disagree that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found reasonable the Examiner’s interpretation that the description in the Fujiwara et al. reference allegedly discloses a server that comprises pieces of map selection data, that the server sends the map selection data to the in-vehicle unit, and that the in-vehicle unit selects a map based on the map selection data sent from the server, as recited in independent claim 8, and likewise the claimed subject matter with respect to a computer, as recited in claim 9, an in-vehicle unit and a computer, as set forth in claims 1-3, and that the map selection data is transmitted from the server to specify a map to be displayed on the in-vehicle unit or the computer, as recited in claims 4-6, the independent claims have been changed to include the language suggested by the Examiner. For at least these reasons, and the reasons presented in Applicants’ April 5, 2006, response, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is not obvious over the Fujiwara et al. publication within the purview of Section 103. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Prompt notification of the same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/John F. Guay, Reg.# 47248/

John F. Guay

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000